

- 93 24. (Original) The apparatus of claim 22, wherein the means for isolating includes a means for pneumatically isolating the first fluidic circuit from the second fluidic circuit.
-

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Delete FIG. 18. Amend FIGS. 17 A-C, 19 and 20 as indicated in red ink on the appended sheets.

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are pending. By this Amendment, the Abstract is amended, the Specification is amended, Figures 17a-17c, 19 and 20 are amended, Figure 18 is deleted, Claims 8, 9, 11, 12, and 17 are cancelled, and Claims 1, 4, 14, 15, 18, and 19 are amended.

Drawings

In paragraph 1 of the Office Action Figures 17a-17c, 18, 19, and 20 were objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a) because they fail to show reference signs which describe structural detail. With this Response, proposed changes to Figure 17a-17c, 19 and 20 are submitted showing the added reference signs in red ink. Figure 18 is deleted. The Applicant notes that the added reference numbers are the same as those appearing in issued U.S. Patent No. 6,248,177, which is a priority document for the present application. Therefore, no new matter is added by these proposed changes.

In section 2 of the Office Action, Figures 18 and 19 were objected to as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(5) because these figures were not mentioned in the description. With this Response, Figure 18 is deleted and the specification is amended to reference Figure 19. As

stated in the preceding paragraph, the amendments to the specification are supported in the parent U.S. Patent 6,248,177, and therefore, no new matter is submitted.

Specification

In sections 3-6 of the Office Action, the Abstract of the disclosure is objected to because of the legal phraseology “comprising” in line 2 and the indication of the term “method”. With the Response, the Abstract is amended to address the cited objections.

Claim Objections

In section 7 of the Office Action, claims 4, 9, 11, 12, 17, and 18 are objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(c) as being improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. With this Response, claims 9, 11, 12, and 17 are cancelled. The remaining objected claims 4 and 18 are amended to clarify their further structural limitations of their respective base claims. The amended language in claims 4 and 18 is being performed for clarification purposes and is not intended or believed to be narrowing of the scope of claims 4 or 18.

The dependency of claim 18 is amended in this Response to indicate its dependency on Independent claim 10, rather than dependant claim 17, which is presently cancelled. No narrowing of the scope of claim 18 is intended by such action.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

In sections 8 and 9 of the Office Action, claims 8, 14-15, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and

distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Claim 8 has been cancelled in the application.

With respect to claims 14 and 15, the phrase “configured to permit burying dwell time” was rejected as vague and indefinite. With this Amendment, claims 14 and 15 are amended to clarify that it is the respective fluid sprayers that are configured to permit selectable variable movement. Therefore, claims 14 and 15 are believed to be in condition for allowance. The Applicant’s amended language to claims 14 and 15 was performed for clarification purposes and is not intended or believed to be narrowing of the scope of these claims.

In regards to claims 19 and 20, the term “closure” is indicated as being vague and indefinite. The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection because the structural component “closure” is identified in the specification on p. 10, line 23 and shown in Figure 1. The “closure” is also submitted as including the lid identified as item 806 and shown in Figure 21. Therefore, Applicant submits that the intended meaning of “closure” is clear from the specification and Figures.

Claim 19 is amended in the present response to correct a typographical error noted by Applicant. No narrowing of the scope by such amendment is intended by such amendment.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102

In sections 10 and 11 of the Office Action, claims 1-3, 5-6, 10, 14-15, and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ballard (U.S. Patent No. 4,133,340). The Applicant submits that in view of the following remarks and the amendments to the claims, the rejected claims are in condition for allowance. In regards to claim 1, the Examiner noted that the clause beginning with “wherein” appears to be directed to intended use and is given little

patentable weight in the claimed apparatus. The Applicant submits that this clause should be given full patentable weight and has amended this clause in claim 1 to reinforce the fact that it contains structural limitation of the claimed apparatus. In particular, the base portion is configured to substantially isolate the first fluidic circuit from the second fluidic circuit. The Applicant submits that Ballard does not teach or disclose first and second fluidic circuits having any measure of isolation. Specifically, Ballard teaches what it refers to as fluid circuits, “being in fluid communication.” (See, Col. 3, lines 45-48). Therefore, Ballard teaches the opposite of isolation. The detailed description of Ballard in view of the Figures, such as Figure 2, make clear that Ballard pumps its cleaning fluid through a single common circuit that communicates with the interior and exterior of a container with respective interior and exterior nozzles. As is discussed on pages 3 and 4 of the application, Ballard suffers from the disadvantage of having this single fluid circuit, which does not allow the washing apparatus to use different cleaning fluids on the inner and outer surfaces of the carrier, if so desired. The Applicant calls the Examiner’s attention to the discussion of certain disadvantages of the prior art (including Ballard) on pages 3-4 of the specification. In view of the foregoing, the Applicant submits that claim 1 is in condition for allowance and that dependent claims 2-3 and 5-6 are allowable by virtue of their dependency on allowable independent claim 1.

The rejection to claim 21 in view of Ballard is believed to be traversed for the same reasons as claim 1. The Applicant submits that the “substantially isolated” term is a structural limitation of the claimed apparatus of claim 21.

Claim 22 includes the term “a means for substantially isolating the first fluidic circuit from the second fluidic circuit.” Here, the Applicant traverses the rejection because Ballard does

not disclose any structure for substantially isolating the first fluidic circuit from the second fluidic circuit, much less teaching structure disclosed in the pending application for isolating the first fluidic circuit from the second fluidic circuit, which is required to sustain the rejection. Therefore, the Applicant submits that claim 22 is in condition for allowance.

Finally, the Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections to claims 10, 14-15, and 19-20 in view of Ballard. The Applicant notes that claim 10 contains the limitation “a door cleaning assembly.” No such structure is taught or disclosed in the Ballard reference. Further, the detailed action does not indicate how Ballard anticipates claim 10 by disclosing a door cleaning assembly. Therefore, the Applicant submits that claim 10, as pending, is in condition for allowance. Dependent claims 14-15 and 19-20 are believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependency on allowable independent claim 10.

Allowable Subject Matter

In sections 12 and 13 of the Office Action, claims 7, 13, 16, and 23-24 were indicated as containing allowable subject matter. The Applicant appreciates the Examiner’s careful review of the dependent claims and the indication of allowable subject matter contained within those dependent claims.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if the Examiner believes it would be useful to advance prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Scott G. Ulbrich", written in a cursive style.

Scott G. Ulbrich
Registration No. 48,005

Customer No. 24113
Patterson, Thuent, Skaar & Christensen, P.A.
4800 IDS Center
80 South 8th Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-2100
Telephone: (612) 349-5776